

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/647,995	WARD, WILLIAM H.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Charles G Freay	3746	

All Participants:

Status of Application: pending

(1) Charles G Freay.

(3) _____.

(2) Thomas McDonough.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 25 February 2004

Time: 1:20 p.m.

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No
 If Yes, provide a brief description: .

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

obviousness type double patenting rejection

Claims discussed:

1-16

Prior art documents discussed:

applicant's prior patent nos. 6,494,686 and 6,682,312

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner noted that the claims of the instant invention were made obvious by claims 1-12 of the 6,494,686 patent. The difference between the claims being that the claims in the instant invention included cylinder blocks as part of the pump structure. The examiner noted that the prior art figures provided in the patents and the application all showed the pumps having cylinder blocks and that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art use a pump with such a cylinder block as a well known and durable pump arrangement. The applicant agreed to provide a terminal disclaimer to overcome the obviousness type double patenting rejection.

On June 25 the examiner called Mr. McDonough to inform him about two minor errors in claims 14 and 15 relating to a typo and an improper dependency. .